



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/699,764	11/03/2003	Albert Sun	MXIC 1520-1	4234
22470 7590 01/11/2007 HAYNES BEFFEL & WOLFELD LLP P O BOX 366 HALF MOON BAY, CA 94019			EXAMINER	
			PATEL, HETUL B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2186	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/11/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/699,764	SUN ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit		
Hetul Patel	2186		

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### **Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 December 2006.

2a)  This action is FINAL.                            2b)  This action is non-final.

3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## **Disposition of Claims**

- 4)  Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6)  Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.  
7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)  The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a)  All    b)  Some \* c)  None of:  
1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6)  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This office action is in response to communication filed on December 08, 2006 and December 13, 2006. Claims 1-32 are presented again for examination.
2. Applicant's arguments filed on December 08, 2006 have been fully considered and are persuasive. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made as shown below.

***Terminal Disclaimer***

3. The terminal disclaimer filed on December 13, 2006 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the expiration dates of US application 10/699,766 and 10/699,756 has been reviewed and is accepted. These terminal disclaimers have been recorded.
4. As a result of these terminal disclaimers, the previous double patenting rejections have been withdrawn.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States

only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-2, 4-6, 11-15, 17, 20-21, 23-25 and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ikeda et al. (USPN: 2003/0184339) hereinafter, Ikeda.

As per claim 1, Ikeda teaches an integrated circuit (i.e. the system LSI 10 in Fig. 1) comprising: an input port (i.e. shown in Fig. 1 connecting device 2 and 15) by which data is received from a source (i.e. the DRAM 2 in Fig. 1) external to the integrated circuit (e.g. see Fig. 1); a configurable logic array (i.e. the Offchip FPGA 14 in Fig. 1) having a programmable configuration defined by configuration data stored in electrically programmable configuration points within the configurable logic array; memory (i.e. the RAM or ROM for storing the execution program 3 shown in Fig. 1) storing instructions for a mission function for the integrated circuit, storing instructions for a configuration load function used to receive configuration data via said input port, and storing instructions for a configuration function used to transfer the configuration data to the programmable configuration points within the configurable logic array; and a processor (i.e. the RISC processor 11 in Fig. 1) coupled to the memory which fetches and executes said instructions from the memory (e.g. see paragraphs [0051]-[0052] and Fig. 1).

As per claims 2 and 4, Ikeda teaches the claimed invention as described above and furthermore, Ikeda teaches that the memory (i.e. the ROM for storing the execution program 3 shown in Fig. 1) comprises a nonvolatile read-only memory (i.e. the ROM) (e.g. see Fig. 1).

As per claims 5 and 6, Ikeda teaches the claimed invention as described above.

In order to load/receive data from external device(s) and transferring the data within the FPGA, the load function/instruction and the transfer function/instruction has to be stored in the memory so the processor can execute/run it.

As per claims 11-13, Ikeda teaches the claimed invention as described above and furthermore, Ikeda teaches that the electrically programmable configuration points comprise floating gate memory cells, nonvolatile, charge programmable memory cells and nonvolatile, programmable memory cells (i.e. the offchip FPGA 14 in Fig. 1).

As per claims 14, Ikeda teaches the claimed invention as described above and furthermore, Ikeda teaches that the integrated circuit further comprises an interface (i.e. the combination of 17, 18, 20 and 21 in Fig. 1) between the processor (i.e. 11 in Fig. 1) and the configurable logic array (i.e. 14 in Fig. 17) supporting the configuration load function (e.g. see Fig. 1).

As per claims 15, Ikeda teaches the claimed invention as described above and furthermore, Ikeda teaches that the memory (i.e. the RAM or ROM for storing the execution program 3 shown in Fig. 1) stores instruction for an in-circuit programming function (e.g. see Fig. 1).

As per claims 17, Ikeda teaches the claimed invention as described above and furthermore, Ikeda teaches that the processor comprises a configurable logic array (i.e. the offchip FPGA 14 in Fig. 1) configured to execute the instructions (e.g. see Fig. 1).

As per claims 20-21, 23-25 and 28-30, see arguments with respect to the rejection of claims 1-2, 4-6 and 11-13, respectively. Claims 20-21, 23-25 and 28-30 are

also rejected based on the same rationale as the rejection of claims 1-2, 4-6 and 11-13, respectively.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 3 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikeda in view of Hsu et al. (USPN: 5,359,570) hereinafter, Hsu.

As per claims 3 and 22, Ikeda teaches that the memory comprises a nonvolatile read-only memory (i.e. the ROM for storing the execution program 3 shown in Fig. 1). However, Ikeda does not teach that the memory comprises a floating gate memory device. Hsu, on the other hand, teaches that floating gate memory devices have the advantage over using the ROM that they can be programmed and erased, electrically, thereby, exhibiting the advantages of ROM memory, i.e., low power consumption and faster access, along with the writeability of magnetic medium. In addition, as integrated circuit fabrication scale increases, greater density can be achieved. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hsu and Ikeda for the benefits described above.

7. Claims 7-8, 18-19 and 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikeda in view of Sun et al. (USPN: 6,401,221) hereinafter, Sun.

As per claims 7 and 8, Ikeda teaches that the claimed invention as described above, but failed to teach the watchdog timer as claimed. Sun, however, discloses a watchdog timer coupled to the CPU (i.e. 122 in Fig. 1), a configuration function that includes using a timer to generate a reset on a response to an error, upon the initialization event, reexecuting the configuration load and configuration function (column 4, lines 15-19). Ikeda and Sun et al. are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, an in circuit programming system that can run downloaded code and reset the system when necessary. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate a watchdog timer and the functions that come with the timer. The suggestion for doing so would have been the ability to reset the system when an error occurs. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Sun and Ikeda for the benefit of resetting the system to obtain the invention as specified in claims 7 and 8.

As per claims 18-19 and 31-32, see arguments with respect to the rejection of claim 8. Claims 18-19 and 31-32 are also rejected based on the same rationale as the rejection of claim 8.

8. Claims 9 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikeda in view of Sun et al. (USPN: 5,901,330) hereinafter, Sun2.

As per claims 9 and 26, Ikeda teaches that the claimed invention as described above, but failed to teach that the configuration load function includes receiving encrypted configuration data via an input port on the integrated circuit, and decrypting

the configuration data. Sun2, however, discloses that the configuration load function includes receiving encrypted configuration data via the input port and then decrypting the configuration data (column 13, lines 59-66). Ikeda and Sun2 are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, an in circuit programming system that can run downloaded code and reset the system when necessary. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to encrypt the incoming data and then decrypt the data. The suggestion for doing so would have been system security. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Sun2 and Ikeda for the benefit of security to obtain the invention as specified in claims 9. The examiner notes that the in-circuit programming and the configuration load function perform the same function and are therefore not dissimilar enough to differentiate given the known definitions of the two terms.

9. Claims 10 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikeda in view of Lawman (USPN: 6,028,445).

As per claim 10 and 27, Ikeda teaches that the claimed invention as described above, but failed to teach that the configuration load function includes receiving compressed configuration data via an input port on the integrated circuit, and uncompressing the configuration data. Lawman, however, discloses a configuration load function that includes receiving compressed configuration data via an input port and then decompressing the data (column 8, lines 12-33). Ikeda and Lawman are analogous art because both deal with downloading data in a compressed format to a

programmable device. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to allow the configuration load function to receive compressed data and to decompress it. The suggestion for doing so would have been to save time and bandwidth. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Lawman and Ikeda for the benefit of time and bandwidth savings to obtain the invention as specified in claims 10.

10. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikeda in view of Akao et al. (USPN: 5,900,008) hereinafter, Akao.

As per claim 16, Ikeda teaches that the claimed invention as described above, but failed to teach that the memory include a protected memory array storing instructions for a first configuration load function, a second memory array storing instructions for a second configuration load function, the first memory array protected from alteration by a programming function, and the second memory accessible to be written/modified by the programming function.

Akao, on the other hand, teaches the memory include a protected memory array storing instructions for a first configuration load function, a second memory array storing instructions for a second configuration load function, the first memory array protected from alteration by a programming function, and the second memory accessible to be written/modified by the programming function (e.g. see the Abstract). Ikeda and Akao are analogous art because they are from a similar problem solving area, processing systems that employ program areas and protection for some of the areas. At the time of

the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add a protected memory area. The suggestion for doing so would have been to protect the data from accidental or malicious overwrites/deletes. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Akao and Ikeda for the benefit of data protection to obtain the invention as specified in claim 16. The examiner notes that Akao does not expressly state protecting the first configuration load function or not protecting the second configuration load function, but that combining Akao and Ikeda would give anyone with skill in the art motivation to protect one of the configuration load functions.

### ***Conclusion***

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
  - The patent of US application no: 09/875,599 which is allowed/patented but not published yet, teaches the claimed invention, i.e. a flash memory within an IC which loads data from an external memory to an internal memory and a processor within the IC executes the instruction from the internal memory.
12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hetul Patel whose telephone number is 571-272-4184. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matt Kim can be reached on 571-272-4182. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

*H.B.Patel* 01/08/2007  
Hetul Patel  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2186